

JS 44 (Rev. 06/17)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

HELEN SWARTZ, Individually

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Miami-Dade County, FL
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)
David S. Dessen, Dessen, Moses & Rossito, 600 Easton Rd, Willow Grove, PA 19090, 215.496.2902

DEFENDANTS

MARRIOTT HOTEL SERVICES, INC., a Delaware Corporation

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant
(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys (If Known)

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- ☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff
- ☒ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)
- ☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant
- ☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)

- | | PTF | DEF | | PTF | DEF |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Citizen of This State | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| Citizen of Another State | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 |
| Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | Foreign Nation | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 |

IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

Click here for: Nature of Suit Code Descriptions

CONTRACT	TORTS	FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES	
<input type="checkbox"/> 110 Insurance <input type="checkbox"/> 120 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 130 Miller Act <input type="checkbox"/> 140 Negotiable Instrument <input type="checkbox"/> 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment <input type="checkbox"/> 151 Medicare Act <input type="checkbox"/> 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) <input type="checkbox"/> 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits <input type="checkbox"/> 160 Stockholders' Suits <input type="checkbox"/> 190 Other Contract <input type="checkbox"/> 195 Contract Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 196 Franchise	PERSONAL INJURY <input type="checkbox"/> 310 Airplane <input type="checkbox"/> 315 Airplane Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 320 Assault, Libel & Slander <input type="checkbox"/> 330 Federal Employers' Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 340 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 345 Marine Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 350 Motor Vehicle <input type="checkbox"/> 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 360 Other Personal Injury <input type="checkbox"/> 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice	PERSONAL INJURY <input type="checkbox"/> 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 367 Health Care/Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERTY <input type="checkbox"/> 370 Other Fraud <input type="checkbox"/> 371 Truth in Lending <input type="checkbox"/> 380 Other Personal Property Damage <input type="checkbox"/> 385 Property Damage Product Liability	<input type="checkbox"/> 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 <input type="checkbox"/> 690 Other LABOR <input type="checkbox"/> 710 Fair Labor Standards Act <input type="checkbox"/> 720 Labor/Management Relations <input type="checkbox"/> 740 Railway Labor Act <input type="checkbox"/> 751 Family and Medical Leave Act <input type="checkbox"/> 790 Other Labor Litigation <input type="checkbox"/> 791 Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION <input type="checkbox"/> 462 Naturalization Application <input type="checkbox"/> 465 Other Immigration Actions	<input type="checkbox"/> 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 <input type="checkbox"/> 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS <input type="checkbox"/> 820 Copyrights <input type="checkbox"/> 830 Patent <input type="checkbox"/> 835 Patent - Abbreviated New Drug Application <input type="checkbox"/> 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY <input type="checkbox"/> 861 HIA (1395ff) <input type="checkbox"/> 862 Black Lung (923) <input type="checkbox"/> 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) <input type="checkbox"/> 864 SSID Title XVI <input type="checkbox"/> 865 RS1 (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS <input type="checkbox"/> 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) <input type="checkbox"/> 871 IRS--Third Party 26 USC 7609	<input type="checkbox"/> 375 False Claims Act <input type="checkbox"/> 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)) <input type="checkbox"/> 400 State Reapportionment <input type="checkbox"/> 410 Antitrust <input type="checkbox"/> 430 Banks and Banking <input type="checkbox"/> 450 Commerce <input type="checkbox"/> 460 Deportation <input type="checkbox"/> 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations <input type="checkbox"/> 480 Consumer Credit <input type="checkbox"/> 490 Cable/Sat TV <input type="checkbox"/> 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange <input type="checkbox"/> 890 Other Statutory Actions <input type="checkbox"/> 891 Agricultural Acts <input type="checkbox"/> 893 Environmental Matters <input type="checkbox"/> 895 Freedom of Information Act <input type="checkbox"/> 896 Arbitration <input type="checkbox"/> 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision <input type="checkbox"/> 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes
REAL PROPERTY <input type="checkbox"/> 210 Land Condemnation <input type="checkbox"/> 220 Foreclosure <input type="checkbox"/> 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment <input type="checkbox"/> 240 Torts to Land <input type="checkbox"/> 245 Tort Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 290 All Other Real Property	CIVIL RIGHTS <input type="checkbox"/> 440 Other Civil Rights <input type="checkbox"/> 441 Voting <input type="checkbox"/> 442 Employment <input type="checkbox"/> 443 Housing/Accommodations <input type="checkbox"/> 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other <input type="checkbox"/> 448 Education	PRISONER PETITIONS Habeas Corpus: <input type="checkbox"/> 463 Alien Detainee <input type="checkbox"/> 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence <input type="checkbox"/> 530 General <input type="checkbox"/> 535 Death Penalty Other: <input type="checkbox"/> 540 Mandamus & Other <input type="checkbox"/> 550 Civil Rights <input type="checkbox"/> 555 Prison Condition <input type="checkbox"/> 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement			

V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- ☒ 1 Original Proceeding
- ☐ 2 Removed from State Court
- ☐ 3 Remanded from Appellate Court
- ☐ 4 Reinstated or Reopened
- ☐ 5 Transferred from Another District (specify)
- ☐ 6 Multidistrict Litigation - Transfer
- ☐ 8 Multidistrict Litigation - Direct File

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):

Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 USC Sec. 12181, et seq.

Brief description of cause:

Equal access to places of public accommodation for persons with disabilities

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

☐ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.

DEMAND \$

CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:

JURY DEMAND:

☐ Yes ☒ No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY

(See instructions):

JUDGE

DOCKET NUMBER

DATE

7/25/2022

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD



FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT #

AMOUNT

APPLYING IFP

JUDGE

MAG. JUDGE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

HELEN SWARTZ, Individually,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No.

MARRIOTT HOTEL SERVICES, INC.,
a Delaware Corporation,

Defendant.

COMPLAINT

Plaintiff, HELEN SWARTZ, Individually, on her behalf and on behalf of all other mobility-impaired individuals similarly-situated, (sometimes referred to as “Plaintiff”), hereby sues the Defendant, MARRIOTT HOTEL SERVICES, INC., a Delaware Corporation (sometimes referred to as “Defendant”) for Injunctive Relief, and attorney’s fees, litigation expenses, and costs pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 USC § 12181 et seq. (“ADA”).

1. Plaintiff, HELEN SWARTZ, resides in Miami Beach, Florida, in the County of Miami-Dade.

2. Defendant’s property, The Notary Hotel, is located at 21 N. Juniper Street, Philadelphia, PA, in the County of Philadelphia.

3. Venue is properly located in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania because venue lies in the judicial district of the property situs. The Defendant’s property is located in and does business within this judicial district.

4. Pursuant to 28 USC § 1331 and 28 USC § 1343, this Court has been given original jurisdiction over actions which arise from the Defendant's violations of Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 USC § 12181 et seq. *See, also*, 28 USC § 2201 and § 2202.

5. Plaintiff, HELEN SWARTZ is a Florida resident, is sui juris, has multiple sclerosis and relies on the use of an electric scooter to ambulate, as she is mobility impaired. She has limited use of her right hand. She qualifies as a person with disabilities, as defined by the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Helen Swartz was born and raised in New York City and moved to the Philadelphia area in 1978 to attend graduate school. After completion of her studies, she founded a business and resided in the area until 2011. She was active in the business community and has many long-standing relationships that she has maintained throughout the years. She also had two children during those years, through which she knew many people.

Her elder daughter and granddaughter live in the Lancaster area and she often meets them, so that they may enjoy cultural activities, dining and shopping. Ms. Swartz lived in the Lancaster area for many years and has many friends there

Helen Swartz visited the property which forms the basis of this lawsuit from October 23 through October 24, 2021, and has reservations to return to the property on February 8 through February 23, 2023, to celebrate her husband's birthday with life-long friends who reside in the Philadelphia area. Ms. Swartz also wishes to avail herself of the goods and services offered to the public at the property, if the facilities are fully accessible and the barriers to access have been corrected. The Plaintiff has encountered architectural barriers at the subject property, which have impaired her use of the facilities and the amenities offered, and have endangered her safety at the facilities and her ability to access the facilities the property has

to offer and use the restrooms.

6. The Plaintiff has encountered architectural barriers at the subject property, which are enumerated in paragraph 10. The barriers to access at the property have endangered her safety, and adversely affected her ability to use the facilities.

7. Defendant owns, leases, leases to, or operates a place of public accommodation as defined by the ADA and the regulations implementing the ADA, 28 CFR 36.201(a) and 36.104. Defendant is responsible for complying with the obligations of the ADA. The place of public accommodation that the Defendant owns, operates, leases or leases to is known as The Notary Hotel, and is located at 21 N. Juniper Street, Philadelphia, PA, in the County of Chester.

8. HELEN SWARTZ has a realistic, credible, existing and continuing threat of discrimination from the Defendant's non-compliance with the ADA with respect to this property as described but not necessarily limited to the allegations in Paragraph 10 of this Complaint. Plaintiff has reasonable grounds to believe that she will continue to be subjected to discrimination in violation of the ADA by the Defendant. HELEN SWARTZ desires to visit not only to avail herself of the goods and services available at the property but to assure herself that this property is in compliance with the ADA so that she and others similarly-situated will have full and equal enjoyment of the property without fear of discrimination.

9. The Defendant has discriminated against the individual Plaintiff by denying her access to, and full and equal enjoyment of, the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations of the hotel, as prohibited by 42 USC § 12182 et seq.

10. The Defendant has discriminated, and is continuing to discriminate, against the Plaintiff in violation of the ADA by failing to, inter alia, have accessible facilities by January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993, if Defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of

\$500,000 or less). A preliminary inspection of has shown that violations exist. These violations which HELEN SWARTZ personally observed or encountered, and which were verified by an ADA expert, include, but are not limited to:

a. The hotel does not provide the required amount of compliant accessible guest rooms, and the accessible rooms are not dispersed among the various classes of accommodations. This is in violation of section 224 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. 28 CFR §36.304. This denies to Plaintiff the full and equal opportunity to stay at the subject hotel. 28 CFR §36.302(e)(1).

b. The accessible features of the facility are not maintained, creating barriers to access for the Plaintiff, as set forth herein, in violation of 28 CFR §36.211.

c. The site has valet parking but does not have a passenger loading zone. This is in violation of sections 209.4 and 503 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.304. The hotel did not make reasonable accommodations to redesign access for this facility. This condition made it difficult for the plaintiff to access the facility.

d. Accessible seating at the dining tables and bars around the hotel building are not provided to a person using a wheelchair. This is in violation of sections 226 & 902 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. The hotel did not make reasonable accommodations during their \$35 million renovation to redesign access for this facility. This condition denied the plaintiff the use of the facility.; 28 CFR §36.201, §36.202, §36.203, §36.304.

e. The lift is not independently operated. This is in violation of section 410.1 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. The hotel did not make reasonable accommodations during their \$20 million renovation to redesign access for this facility. This condition denied the plaintiff the use of the facility.; 28 CFR §36.201, §36.203, §36.304.

f. The keypad to operate the elevator car controls is out of reach to a person using a wheelchair. This is in violation of section 407 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design. The hotel did not make reasonable accommodations during their \$20 million renovation to redesign access for this facility. This condition denied the plaintiff the use of the facility.; 28 CFR §36.201, §36.202, §36.203, §36.304.

g. Items in the Fitness Center are out of reach to a person in a wheelchair. The hotel did not make reasonable accommodations to redesign access for this facility. This is in violation of section 305 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR

§36.203, §36.302 & §36.304.

h. A clear floor space is not provided to access the signage denoting the Fitness Center. The hotel did not make reasonable accommodations to redesign access for this facility. This is in violation of section 308 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.203, §36.302 & §36.304.

i. Items in the hotel concession are out of reach to a person in a wheelchair. The hotel did not make reasonable accommodations during their \$35 million renovation to redesign access for this facility. This is in violation of section 308 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.203, §36.302 & §36.304. This condition denied the plaintiff to independently access items on the concession shelves.

j. In the accessible guestroom #1212 which hotel deemed an accessible guestroom, a turning space is not provided to access the outlet by the side of the bed. The hotel did not make reasonable accommodations during their \$20 million renovation to redesign access for this facility. This is in violation of section 806.2.6 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.201, §36.203, §36.302 & §36.304. This condition denied the plaintiff to independently access the facility.

k. In the accessible guestroom #1212, which hotel deemed an accessible guestroom, a clear floor space is not provided to access the closet. The hotel did not make reasonable accommodations during their \$20 million renovation to redesign access for this facility. This is in violation of section 811.2 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.203, §36.302 & §36.304. This condition denied the plaintiff to hang up her clothes independently.

l. In the accessible guestroom #1212, which hotel deemed an accessible guestroom, the closet rod and shelf are out of reach to a person in a wheelchair. The hotel did not make reasonable accommodations during their \$20 million renovation to redesign access for this facility. This is in violation of sections 308 & 811.3 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.203, §36.302 & §36.304. This condition denied the plaintiff to independently access the facility.

m. In the accessible guestroom #1212 which hotel deemed an accessible guestroom, a forward reach is not provided to access the light switch on lamp that is above the desk. The hotel did not make reasonable accommodations during their \$20 million renovation to redesign access for this facility. This is in violation of sections 308.2 & 806 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.203, §36.302 & §36.304. This condition denied the plaintiff to independently access the facility.

n. In the accessible guestroom #1212 which hotel deemed an accessible guestroom, the operable part of the window control requires tight grasping, pinching, or twisting of the wrist. The hotel did not make reasonable accommodations during their

\$20 million renovation to redesign access for this facility. This is in violation of sections 309.4 & 806 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.203, §36.302 & §36.304. This condition denied the plaintiff to independently access the facility.

o. In the accessible guestroom #1212 which hotel deemed an accessible guestroom, the window control is out of reach to a person in a wheelchair. The hotel did not make reasonable accommodations during their \$20 million renovation to redesign access for this facility. This is in violation of sections 308 & 806 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.203, §36.302 & §36.304. This condition denied the plaintiff to independently access the facility.

p. In the accessible guestroom #1212 a forward reach is not provided to access the lamp that is between the beds. The hotel did not make reasonable accommodations to redesign access for this facility. This is in violation of sections 308 & 806 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.203, §36.302 & §36.304. This condition denied the plaintiff to independently access the facility.

q. In the accessible guestroom #1212, which hotel deemed an accessible guestroom, the shower unit is spaced too far from the side wall where the shower seat is located. The hotel did not make reasonable accommodations during their \$20 million renovation to redesign access for this facility. This is in violation of section 806.2.4 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.203, §36.302 & §36.304. This condition denied the plaintiff to independently access the facility.

r. In guestroom #1212 which hotel deemed an accessible guestroom, the shower spray unit in the roll-in shower does not have an on/off control with a non-positive shut-off. The hotel did not make reasonable accommodations during to redesign access for this facility. This is in violation of section 806.2.4 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.304. This condition made it difficult for the plaintiff to access the facility.

s. In the accessible guestroom #1212 which hotel deemed an accessible guestroom, the shower unit is out of reach to a person in a wheelchair. The hotel did not make reasonable accommodations to redesign access for this facility. This is in violation of section 806 .2.4 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.201 and §36.304. This condition denied the plaintiff to independently access the facility.

t. In the accessible guestroom #1212, which hotel deemed an accessible guestroom, the mirror above the lavatory is out of reach to a person in a wheelchair. The hotel did not make reasonable accommodations to redesign access for this facility. This is in violation of section 806.2.4 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.203, §36.302 & §36.304. This condition denied the plaintiff to independently access the facility.

u. In the accessible guestroom #1212, which hotel deemed an accessible guestroom, a forward reach is not provided to access the outlet by the lavatory. The hotel did not make reasonable accommodations to redesign access for this facility. This is in violation of sections 308 & 806 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.203, §36.302 & §36.304. This condition denied the plaintiff to independently access the facility.

v. In the accessible guestroom #1212 which hotel deemed an accessible guestroom, the flush control is on closed side of the water closet. The hotel did not make reasonable accommodations during their \$20 million renovation to redesign access for this facility. This is in violation of section 806.2.4 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.203, §36.302 & §36.304. This condition denied the plaintiff to independently access the facility.

w. In the accessible guestroom #1212, which hotel deemed an accessible guestroom, the toilet paper dispenser is not properly located in front of the water closet. The hotel did not make reasonable accommodations to redesign access for this facility. This is in violation of section 806.2.4 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.203, §36.302 & §36.304. This condition denied the plaintiff to independently access the facility.

x. The lobby carpet is not securely attached to the floor. The hotel did not make reasonable accommodations to redesign access for this facility. This is in violation of section 302.2 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.203, §36.302 & §36.304. This condition made it a hazard for the plaintiff to independently access the facility.

y. In the Notary hotel toilet room, the mirrors are too high for a person in a wheelchair to see themselves. The hotel did not make reasonable accommodations to redesign access for this facility. This is in violation of section 603.3 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.203, §36.302 & §36.304. This condition denied the plaintiff to independently access the facility.

z. In the Notary hotel toilet room, an object is spaced to close above the side grab bar by the water closet. The hotel did not make reasonable accommodations to redesign access for this facility. This is in violation of section 609.3 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.203, §36.302 & §36.304. This condition denied the plaintiff to independently access the facility.

aa. The stairway does not have proper handrail extensions. The hotel did not make reasonable accommodations to redesign access for this facility. This is in violation of section 505.10 of the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design: 28 CFR §36.203, §36.302 & §36.304. This condition denied the plaintiff to independently access the facility.

11. All of the foregoing cited violations are violations of both the 1991 Americans with Disabilities Act Guidelines (ADAAG) and the 2010 Standards for Accessible Design, as adopted by the Department of Justice.

12. The discriminatory violations described in Paragraph 10 are not an exclusive list of the Defendant's ADA violations. Plaintiff requires the inspection of the Defendant's place of public accommodation in order to photograph and measure all of the discriminatory acts violating the ADA and all of the barriers to access. The individual Plaintiff, and all other individuals similarly-situated, have been denied access to, and have been denied the benefits of services, programs and activities of the Defendant's facilities, and have otherwise been discriminated against and damaged by the Defendant because of the Defendant's ADA violations, as set forth above. The individual Plaintiff, and all others similarly-situated will continue to suffer such discrimination, injury and damage without the immediate relief provided by the ADA as requested herein. In order to remedy this discriminatory situation, the Plaintiff requires an inspection of the Defendant's place of public accommodation in order to determine all of the areas of non-compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

13. Defendant have discriminated against the individual Plaintiff by denying her access to full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations of its place of public accommodation or commercial facility in violation of 42 USC § 12181 *et seq.* and 28 CFR. 36.302 *et seq.* Furthermore, the Defendant continue to discriminate against the Plaintiff, and all those similarly-situated by failing to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford all offered goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages or accommodations to individuals with disabilities; and by failing to take such efforts that may be necessary to ensure

that no individual with a disability is excluded, denied services, segregated or otherwise treated differently than other individuals because of the absence of auxiliary aids and services.

14. Plaintiff is without adequate remedy at law and is suffering irreparable harm. Considering the balance of hardships between the Plaintiff and Defendant, a remedy in equity is warranted. Furthermore, the public interest would not be disserved by a permanent injunction. Plaintiff has retained the undersigned counsel and is entitled to recover attorney's fees, costs and litigation expenses from the Defendant pursuant to 42 USC § 12205 and 28 CFR 36.505.

15. Defendant is required to remove the existing architectural barriers to the physically disabled, when such removal is readily achievable for its place of public accommodation that has existed prior to January 26, 1992, 28 CFR 36.304(a); in the alternative, if there has been an alteration to Defendant's place of public accommodation since January 26, 1992, then the Defendant is required to ensure to the maximum extent feasible, that the altered portions of the facility are readily accessible to and useable by individuals with disabilities, including individuals who use walkers and wheelchairs, 28 CFR 36.402; and finally, if the Defendant's facility is one which was designed and constructed for first occupancy subsequent to January 26, 1993, as defined in 28 CFR 36.401, then the Defendant's facility must be readily accessible to and useable by individuals with disabilities as defined by the ADA.

16. Notice to Defendant is not required as a result of the Defendant's failure to cure the violations by January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993, if Defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). All other conditions precedent have been met by Plaintiff or waived by the Defendant.

17. Pursuant to 42 USC § 12188, this Court is provided with authority to grant Plaintiff Injunctive Relief, including an order to require the Defendant to alter the to make those

facilities readily accessible and useable to the Plaintiff and all other persons with disabilities as defined by the ADA; or by closing the facility until such time as the Defendant cure its violations of the ADA. The Order shall further require the Defendant to maintain the required assessable features on an ongoing basis.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests:

- a. The Court issue a Declaratory Judgment that determines that the Defendant at the commencement of the subject lawsuit are in violation of Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 USC § 12181 et seq.
- b. Injunctive relief against the Defendant including an order to make all readily achievable alterations to the facility; or to make such facility readily accessible to and useable by individuals with disabilities to the extent required by the ADA; and to require the Defendant to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford all offered goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages or accommodations to individuals with disabilities; and by failing to take such steps that may be necessary to ensure that no individual with a disability is excluded, denied services, segregated or otherwise treated differently than other individuals because of the absence of auxiliary aids and services.
- c. An award of attorney's fees, costs and litigation expenses pursuant to 42 USC § 12205.
- d. Such other relief as the Court deems just and proper, and/or is allowable under Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Dated: _____, 2022

Respectfully submitted,



David S. Dessen, Esq. (I.D. 17627)
Dessen, Moses & Rossitto
600 Easton Road
Willow Grove, PA 19090
Telephone: 215.496.2902
Facsimile: 215.658.0747
ddessen@dms-lawyer.com

John P. Fuller, Esq.,
pro hac vice pending
Fuller, Fuller & Associates, P.A.
12000 Biscayne Blvd., Suite 502
North Miami, FL 33181
Telephone: (305) 891-5199
Facsimile: (305) 893-9505
jpf@fullerfuller.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff Helen Swartz

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

DESIGNATION FORM

(to be used by counsel or pro se plaintiff to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to the appropriate calendar)

Address of Plaintiff: c/o David S. Dessen, Dessen, Moses & Rossito, 600 Easton Rd, Willow Grove, PA 19090

Address of Defendant: _____

Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: The Notary Hotel, 21 N. Juniper Street, Philadelphia, PA 19107

RELATED CASE, IF ANY:

Case Number: _____ Judge: _____ Date Terminated: _____

Civil cases are deemed related when **Yes** is answered to any of the following questions:

- | | | |
|--|------------------------------|--|
| 1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action of this court? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case ☐ is / ☒ is not related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above.

DATE: 7/25/2022 D S Dessen Must sign here
Attorney-at-Law / Pro Se Plaintiff

176271

Attorney I.D. # (if applicable)

CIVIL: (Place a ✓ in one category only)

A. Federal Question Cases:

- ☐ 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts
- ☐ 2. FELA
- ☐ 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury
- ☐ 4. Antitrust
- ☐ 5. Patent
- ☐ 6. Labor-Management Relations
- ☒ 7. Civil Rights
- ☐ 8. Habeas Corpus
- ☐ 9. Securities Act(s) Cases
- ☐ 10. Social Security Review Cases
- ☐ 11. All other Federal Question Cases
(Please specify): _____

B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:

- ☐ 1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts
- ☐ 2. Airplane Personal Injury
- ☐ 3. Assault, Defamation
- ☐ 4. Marine Personal Injury
- ☐ 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury
- ☐ 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): _____
- ☐ 7. Products Liability
- ☐ 8. Products Liability – Asbestos
- ☐ 9. All other Diversity Cases
(Please specify): _____

ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION

(The effect of this certification is to remove the case from eligibility for arbitration.)

I, DAVID S. DESSEN, pro se, counsel of record or pro se plaintiff, do hereby certify:

- ☐ Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, § 3(c) (2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs:
- ☒ Relief other than monetary damages is sought.

DATE: 7/25/2022 D S Dessen Sign here (if applicable)
Attorney-at-Law / Pro Se Plaintiff

176271

Attorney I.D. # (if applicable)

NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

HELEN SWARTZ, Individually,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO.

MARRIOTT HOTEL SERVICES, INC.,
a Delaware Corporation

:

In accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counsel for plaintiff shall complete a Case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the time of filing the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverse side of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding said designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on the plaintiff and all other parties, a Case Management Track Designation Form specifying the track to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.

SELECT ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CASE MANAGEMENT TRACKS:

- (a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255. ()
- (b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits. ()
- (c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2. ()
- (d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos. ()
- (e) Special Management – Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are commonly referred to as complex and that need special or intense management by the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special management cases.) ()
- (f) Standard Management – Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks. (X)

7/25/2022
Date

David S. Dessen
Attorney-at-law

Plaintiff
Attorney for

215-658-1400
Telephone

215-658-0747
FAX Number

ddessen@dms-lawyer.com
E-Mail Address

(Civ. 660) 10/02